

Remarks

This is in response to the final Office Action mailed March 2, 2007. Claims 25, 26, 29-38, 42, and 43 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 24 and 41 are amended. Claims 45-67 are added. Claims 24, 41, and 45-67 remain pending. Reconsideration and allowance are requested for the following reasons.

In the Action, claims 24-26, 29-38, 42, and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderson et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,909,155. This rejection is respectfully traversed, and the correctness of the rejection is not conceded. Reconsideration is requested for the following reasons.

Claim 24 is directed to a module for containing a circuit. Claim 24 recites, among other limitations, at least one receptacle defined through the front wall for receiving a circuit component, the receptacle being generally rectangular and including a length, a width and a depth, the length being less than or equal to .5 inches, the width being less than or equal to .2 inches, and the depth being of sufficient magnitude to allow the receptacle to function as an RF choke for choking RF emissions generated within the housing, the depth being at least .3 inches.

Anderson discloses a module 10 with receptacles. However, there is no suggestion in Anderson that the receptacles are of a depth of sufficient magnitude to allow the receptacle to function as an RF choke for choking RF emissions generated within the housing, the depth being at least .3 inches, as recited by claim 24. In contrast, Anderson discloses use of a separate cover 100 to provide EMI shielding. Anderson, column 5, lines 22-33.

Further, varying the depth of the receptacles in the module has not been recognized in the prior art as achieving a particular result, i.e., choking emissions. Therefore, as noted at MPEP 2144.05(II)(B), since the parameter at issue (i.e., the depth of the receptacle) has not been recognized to achieve a particular result in the prior art (i.e., choking emissions), optimization of the depth of the receptacle would not be routine to one skilled in the art. Id.

Reconsideration and allowance of claim 24 are therefore requested.

Claim 41 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderson in view of Voge, U.S. Patent No. 4,873,600. This rejection is respectfully traversed, and the correctness of the rejection is not conceded. Reconsideration is requested for the following reasons.

Claim 41 is directed to a module for containing a circuit. Claim 41 recites, among other limitations, at least one receptacle for receiving a circuit component, the receptacle being configured to function as an RF choke, and a non-metallic cover for covering the receptacle.

The Action concedes that Anderson discloses a metallic cover 100 and fails to disclose a non-metallic cover. The Action states that it would have been obvious to construct the metallic cover of Anderson using a non-metallic material because Vogele teaches the use of a plastic material to form a junction box to prevent corrosion in a harsh marine environment.

It is respectfully suggested that such a modification cannot be made because the substitution of a plastic material for the metallic cover 100 disclosed by Anderson would render the cover unusable for its intended purpose for the following reasons. See MPEP 2143.01(V) (noting that, “[i]f proposed modification would render the prior art invention being modified unsatisfactory for its intended purpose, then there is no suggestion or motivation to make the proposed modification”). In Anderson, cover 100 is made of an electrically conductive material such as metal to provide adequate EMI shielding. Anderson, column 5, lines 22-33. If cover 100 is instead made of plastic, as suggested in the Action, cover 100 would not provide EMI shielding and would therefore be unsatisfactory for its intended purpose. Consequently, there is no motivation to make the suggested substitution of plastic for the metal cover disclosed by Anderson.

Reconsideration and allowance of claim 41 are therefore requested.

Independent claims 45, 66, and 67 are added, and claims 46-65 depend from claim 45.

Claim 45 is directed to a telecommunications module. Claim 45 recites, in part, a receptacle being configured as a RF choke that chokes RF emissions generated within the housing to a level such that the module radiates signals that are 100 db down or better from a carrier across a frequency range of 5 megahertz to 1 gigahertz even in the absence of a cover over the receptacle. Anderson fails to disclose or suggest a receptacle configured in this manner. For example, as noted previously, Anderson discloses the metallic cover 100 that is used to attenuate signals. Anderson fails to disclose or suggest that the receptacle is a RF choke that chokes RF emissions generated within the housing, as recited by claim 45.

Claims 46-65 depend from claim 45 and further distinguish over the cited art.

Claim 66 is directed to a telecommunications module having a receptacle including at least one guide surface for channeling the plug into the plug connector when the plug is inserted

into the receptacle, the at least one guide surface being configured such that misalignment of the plug relative to the plug connector is not possible during the insertion process. Anderson fails to disclose such a guide surface.

Claim 67 is directed to a method for making a telecommunications module, including selecting a depth of the receptacle such that the receptacle chokes RF emissions generated by the radio frequency circuitry to a desired level, the depth being selected based on a frequency of the RF emissions and a size of the receptacle. As previously noted, Anderson fails to disclose or suggest that the receptacles disclosed by Anderson chock RF emissions, since Anderson discloses the user of the cover 100 to do so. Therefore, Anderson fails to suggest selecting a depth of the receptacle such that the receptacle chokes RF emissions generated by the radio frequency circuitry to a desired level, the depth being selected based on a frequency of the RF emissions and a size of the receptacle, as recited by claim 67.

Consideration and allowance of these claims 45-67 are therefore requested.

Favorable reconsideration in the form of a Notice of Allowance is requested. Please contact the undersigned attorney with any questions regarding this application.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.
P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903
612.332.5300

Dated: August 31, 2007

/Robert A. Kalinsky/
Name: Robert A. Kalinsky
Reg. No.: 50,471